

To: McGrath, Shaun[McGrath.Shaun@epa.gov]
From: Card, Joan
Sent: Tue 9/22/2015 3:50:39 PM
Subject: FW: Heads Up - today's GKM monitoring call

fyi

From: Garcia, Bert
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 9:43 AM
To: Card, Joan; Hestmark, Martin; Wharton, Steve; Ostrander, David; Merritt, Steven
Cc: Spence, Sandra; McKean, Deborah
Subject: FW: Heads Up - today's GKM monitoring call

FYI: broad scope of concerns from New Mexico in preliminary response to GKM monitoring, that extend beyond the proposed monitoring plan.

Bert Garcia

Director, Ecosystems Protection Program

EPA Region 8

From: Tulis, Dana
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 9:07 AM
To: Gray, David
Cc: Natarajan, Nitin; Loop, Travis; Kopocis, Ken; Coleman, Sam; Wall, Tom; Spence, Sandra; Foster, Althea; Garcia, Bert; Barry, Michael; McKean, Deborah
Subject: Re: Heads Up - today's GKM monitoring call

Thanks David, Today's meeting is mostly a listening session and then we will respond formally. Adding in other speakers for awareness.

Dana S. Tulis

Deputy Office Director

Office of Emergency Management

US EPA

202-564-7938

On Sep 22, 2015, at 10:46 AM, "Gray, David" <gray.david@epa.gov> wrote:

All – For your information.

We received some comments on the LTP that NM was sharing with the Hill. They are:

- It does not appear to acknowledge that much higher concentrations of contaminants and sediment exist in Colorado and over likely many years of storm events and spring run off this will migrate to NM and other downstream states. This may accumulate in NM farming soils and low flow areas in the river. Limiting it to only one year of monitoring may not be sufficient.
- No monitoring of heavy metals in irrigated croplands is proposed.
- No monitoring of crops and livestock is proposed.
- Biological impacts usually require longer term monitoring so again, limiting to 1 year is likely not adequate.
- Public water supply wells should be included to determine any impacts that may occur over time and the associated sludge sampling for disposal by the systems (we have included this in the NMED plan)
- No groundwater monitoring was mentioned in the plan. We were aware of this and in discussions EPA asked us how much this would cost and that they “might” be able to get us superfund money for this. We believe GW sampling private wells semi-annual/seasonal/quarterly follow up sampling is a good idea. Our plan will address this.

We also received this from NM yesterday.

The State of New Mexico does not believe it is appropriate for EPA to lead monitoring effort regarding the impacts of the Gold King Mine Release. As the responsible party, there

is a clear conflict of interest. The State of New Mexico would never allow a party responsible for creating an environmental disaster to monitor itself. As we have indicated to EPA numerous times over the past few weeks, we believe the most productive path forward is for EPA to fund the long term monitoring plan the State is currently developing with local government agencies, public universities and non-governmental organizations. We believe a locally-driven monitoring plan is the best path forward and will be happy to discuss this with you in more detail at your earliest convenience.

These topics may come up on today's call.

David